

**Mission Bay Landfill  
Technical Advisory Committee  
CAB, 12th Floor Conference Room B  
November 19, 2004  
10:00 am to 12:00 pm**

**Meeting Minutes**

TAC Members Present

Donna Frye	Jeoffry Gordon	Barry Pulver	Judy Swink	Robert Curtis
David Kennedy	Rebecca Lafreniere	Brian McDaniel	Ben Leaf	

Alternate TAC Members Present

Kathleen Blavatt	George Murphy	Hiram Sarabia	Susan Orlofsky
------------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

TAC Members Absent

Bruce Reznik	John Wilks	Dave Huntley
Robert Tukey	Frank Gormlie	

Interested Parties/Alternates

Glenn Gentile	Patrick Owen	Scot Andrews	Kevin Carr
John Fields	Vicky Gallagher	Tessa McRae	Terry Rodgers

Staff

Steven Fontana	Sylvia Castillo	Beth Murray
Ray Purtee	John Lamb	

The meeting was called to order by Councilmember Frye. Self introductions were made. A quorum was present.

**Approval of Minutes**

The October meeting minutes were reviewed and approved with one change to page 2: the fifth sentence of the second paragraph is revised to read “The start of this survey was delayed to last week to synchronize the salinity study with pronounced cyclical tides.”

Steve Fontana spoke about the ice plant removal by the Planning department's Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) staff on December 11th and January 22nd. Environmental Services will provide a steel container and free disposal for this project. MSCP staff plan to use a small tractor with an attached rake to rake up the ice plant. This is a different method than what was presented to the group at the previous meeting. Councilmember Frye asked that the California Native Plant Society be informed of this beforehand, because they aren't aware that equipment is going to be used. John Lamb will follow up on this.

### **Status of Site Assessment**

Tessa McRae explained that borings have been completed and pressure transducers installed into the groundwater wells. Then heavy rains came, but the up side is if the rains flushed contaminants out of the site, then the groundwater sampling performed may have caught this. We are still waiting for laboratory results from completed sampling, including low level metals analysis, hexavalent chromium, and VOC's.

Drive point sampling within the tidal zone is scheduled to be performed next week.

By Thanksgiving all sampling should be completed and then we'll be waiting for the labs to turn the samples around with results.

Councilmember Frye asked if any unusual readings or anomalies have been observed so far? Tessa answered none so far, but not all lab data is in or has been analyzed.

A question was asked "Is thallium being tested for?" to which Tessa replied, "Yes."

### **Review of RWQCB and OEHHA Letters**

The OEHHA letter of 11/17/04 was handed out and reviewed. Initial discussion concerned whether OEHHA had gotten the latest version of the site assessment work plan prepared by SCS and whether OEHHA and the RWQCB will review the final health risk assessment. A list of changes to the work plan was requested. Ray Purtee will follow up on this.

On whether OEHHA and the RWQCB will review the health risk assessment, Rebecca LaFreniere answered that the State Integrated Waste Management Board asked that OEHHA review the work plan, and she will see to it that the request is put thru for OEHHA to review the health risk assessment. Brian McDaniel said that the RWQCB will review the health risk assessment and probably draft site specific Waste Discharge Requirements for the Mission Bay Landfill incorporating the report's recommendations.

Attention turned to page two of the OEHHA letter, paragraph entitled "Collection of Background Samples for Analysis of Metals." The statement was debated in this paragraph that the southeastern portion of Fiesta Island at the same elevation of the landfill, would likely be a place to collect representative background soil samples. It is well known locally that sewer sludge drying beds were present at Fiesta Island for many years. Tessa felt that perhaps OEHHA did not have access to all the historical photos SCS reviewed of this area. She added that ideally background soil samples should only be taken from undisturbed strata, which precludes any area around the landfill, if not all of Mission Bay.

Questions asked included “Why were background comparisons used in past reports but not in today’s?” and “How can quality assurance be provided for?” Ray Purtee answered that our assessment will evaluate what is present at the site today and whether the levels of contamination can harm us or the environment, rather than comparing what’s out there to some background as was done in the past. This is more in line with the precautionary principle.

On page three of the OEHHA letter, paragraph entitled “Filtration of Groundwater Samples,” Tessa McRae stated that SCS will perform sampling on one of the wells both ways- filtered and unfiltered, in order to compare the results. Soil sampling performed would also catch the presence of contaminants of concern mentioned in this paragraph. In the next paragraph entitled “Analysis of Hexavalent Chromium,” Tessa stated that the US EPA method recommended here, 7199, would be used.

It was pointed out that both OEHHA letters critique the risk assessment to be performed by SCS. Councilmember Frye recommended that group members draft their own reply to the OEHHA letters, then bring them to the next meeting for discussion.

### **Review of Application to Coastal Commission for Promenade**

Pat Owen of Sea World gave a presentation on the proposed Promenade for South Shores. This promenade is part of the Mission Bay Park Master Plan as well as the Sea World Master Plan. It consists of a walkway along the shoreline up to 50’ wide in places, with landscaping, lighting benches and decorative paving. The City is reviewing the project plans and eventually it would be presented to the California Coastal Commission for a permit to construct.

As shown in Pat’s presentation there would be no major excavations or grading work for the Promenade, as it mostly follows existing land contours. There would be some excavations for irrigation piping, utilities, and foundations for planters and planter retaining walls.

Concern was expressed that as the landfill boundaries aren’t known, would soil samples be collected during construction to gather data on the landfill limits or on soil contamination? Pat answered that this project is outside the known boundaries of the landfill. Sylvia Castillo stated that there are previous boring results for groundwater wells and probes that can provide information on the landfill limits. Rebecca LaFreniere stated since this project is within 1000’ of the known limits of the landfill, the LEA has reviewed the project plans and issued requirements during construction including preparation of health and safety plans and environmental monitoring.

Pat Owen stated that the project is presently on hold pending the outcome of the site assessment and possibly could not be constructed if not feasible.

Concern was expressed that the site is unsafe because previous borings found deadly explosive gases, specifically in the “J” borings, and projects such as this would only encourage people to come to this area. Pat answered that Sea World and the Coastal Commission agreed that this project will not move forward until the site assessment results have been promulgated.

### **Public Comment**

The question was asked “What date will the site assessment report be released?” Tessa answered that though lab results are still pending, the report is scheduled for completion in February 2005.

Councilmember Frye asked the group if a December meeting should be held and a motion was made, seconded, and approved to skip December and hold the next meeting in January. A tentative meeting date of January 21, 2005 was set.

Brian McDaniel distributed summary results from the City's most recent Mission Bay landfill groundwater monitoring report. He briefly went over the results, which show them to be consistent with previous monitoring reports. Some concerns that were expressed included "Did we have all the references mentioned in these excerpts?" and "It appears that quality control blanks contained contaminants" and "What do the results shown mean?" Tessa will follow up to see that the references are in the files and it was decided to invite the author of the report, Shaw/EMCON, to the next meeting to discuss the results. Concerning a yardstick to compare the results to, Dr. Kennedy will give a talk on water fluoridation chemicals and Jeff Greene will speak on the Water Quality Purity Act.

A letter dated 11/19/04 from the Mission Bay Park Toxic Cleanup was passed around and reviewed. In part it pointed out the City's failure to forward letters received in May, '04 from OEHHHA and the RWQCB until October, '04, and closed with the recommendation that until the TAC can review the withheld documents, any consultant work plan changes, and the expected State response, field tests in South Shores be suspended. Ray Purtee replied that as the City's project manager, he was the one who held onto the letters and delayed their distribution. These letters were comments on the draft site assessment work plan, but were received after the go-ahead to begin the field work. SCS had received them, incorporated changes recommended into the field work, and was drafting a response, but this occurred right when the field work activities were getting started and delayed the written response. Ray wanted to distribute the letters together with the written response.

Group comments included that the City's failure to distribute May '04 letters from OEHHHA and the RWQCB until October '04, was a dastardly act and reprehensible given the TAC's well known mission of information sharing; another comment was that this was a major failure, but should not stop work on the project.

Councilmember Frye reminded the group that timely information sharing is key to our mission and that May documents should be distributed in May. Those critical of the process should also comply, for example, giving the TAC advance notice when bringing up new issues or findings, rather than withholding them for last minute distribution. The result of the May letters was no substantial change to the field work, and SCS was able to incorporate recommended changes into the work.

There was no motion made to suspend the field work.

#### **Items for next agenda**

- Shaw/EMCON groundwater monitoring results explained.
- Talk on water fluoridation chemicals
- Talk on Water Quality Purity Act

#### **Future Meetings**

- Friday, January 21, 2005, 10:00 am to 12:00 pm, CAB, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor, Conference Room B